

# A. Introduction/Overview

On September 30, 2002, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) submitted the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) application A.02-09-043 for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN), accompanied by its Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project. The CPUC identifies the Jefferson-Martin Project as Application A.02-09-043. This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) has been prepared by the California Public Utilities Commission as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to inform the public and to meet the needs of local, State, and federal permitting agencies to consider the project proposed by PG&E (or "the Applicant").

The project proposed by PG&E (the "Proposed Project") is described briefly below, and in detail in Part B of this EIR. This EIR does not make a recommendation regarding the approval or denial of the project; it is purely informational in content, and will be used by the CPUC in considering whether or not to approve the Proposed Project or an alternative.

This EIR evaluates and presents the environmental impacts that are expected to result from construction and operation of PG&E's Proposed Project, and presents recommended mitigation measures that, if adopted, would avoid or minimize the significant environmental impacts identified. In accordance with CEQA requirements, this EIR also identifies alternatives to the Proposed Project that could avoid or minimize significant environmental impacts associated with the project as proposed by PG&E (including the No Project Alternative), and evaluates the environmental impacts associated with these alternatives. Based on this environmental impact assessment, as well as the relative sensitivities of impacts in the study region, this EIR identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative as required by CEQA.

The contents of this DEIR reflects input by government officials, agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and concerned members of the public during the EIR scoping period following the CPUC's publication of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR (January 20, 2003). During this comment period, several public involvement activities were completed: distribution of the NOP and a scoping meeting notice, establishment of an Internet web page and a telephone hotline, four public scoping meetings, and meetings with a number of affected local jurisdictions (see details in Section H). Consultation with agencies also continued after the formal scoping period ended.

This section is organized as follows: Section A.1 briefly describes the Jefferson-Martin Project as proposed by PG&E; Section A.2 explains the area's electric system and presents information related to the need for the Proposed Project. Section A.3 described agency use of the EIR, and includes a brief description of the CPUC process for consideration of project approval; and Section A.4 presents a Reader's Guide to this EIR, explaining how it is organized.

## A.1 History and Overview of Proposed Project

The Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project, as proposed by PG&E, includes the following components:

- Installation of a new approximately 27-mile 230 kV transmission line with overhead and underground segments: the southern 14.7 miles of this line would be installed on a rebuilt version of PG&E's existing Jefferson-Martin 60 kV double-circuit transmission line and the northern 12.4 miles would be installed underground in city streets and in the BART right-of-way.

- Dismantling the existing Jefferson-Martin overhead 60 kV double-circuit tower line and re-building the towers to enable the east side to operate at 60 kV and the west side at 230 kV. Approximately 100 structures would be removed and subsequently replaced.
- Construction of a new transition station near the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive just east of Skyline Boulevard/Highway 35 to transition from the overhead 230 kV transmission line to the 13-mile underground 230 kV transmission line.
- Modification of the existing Jefferson and Martin Substations to accommodate the new 230 kV transmission line.
- Modifications to equipment at the existing San Mateo, Ralston, Millbrae and Monta Vista Substations and the Hillsdale Junction switching station.

The Jefferson-Martin Project resulted from a comprehensive, long-term planning process undertaken in April 1999 by several stakeholders. PG&E and the California Independent System Operator (ISO) formed a stakeholders study group to evaluate the adequacy of power supply to San Francisco and northern San Mateo County and to identify the best alternatives to meet future demand. This effort was initiated following the December 1998 accident that interrupted electric service to a significant portion of San Francisco and the northern Peninsula. Stakeholder group participants included PG&E, the ISO, the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF), the CPUC, the California Energy Commission (CEC), generating companies, and others.

In October 2000, the stakeholders study group submitted a report entitled *San Francisco Peninsula Long-Term Electric Transmission Planning Technical Study* to the ISO Board of Governors. The report concluded that, unless new generation resources are built in San Francisco, new transmission facilities would be needed to meet customer demand by the summer of 2006. Because of uncertainties related to existing and potential new power generation in San Francisco, the report identified a number of transmission alternatives that could meet this need. After consideration of feasibility, reliability, and cost, the stakeholders group selected the Jefferson-Martin Project as the preferred electrical solution. Later in October 2000, the ISO Board of Governors approved the Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project (without regard to route). Subsequently, PG&E completed feasibility studies and updated cost estimates for the three main electrical alternatives discussed during the stakeholder process and for several routing variants of the Jefferson-Martin Project for presentation to the CPUC.

In April 2002, the ISO granted its final approval for construction and addition to the ISO controlled grid of the Jefferson-Martin Project (again without regard to route). In response to comments from community groups, the ISO Board of Governors also instructed its staff to work with CCSF and interested stakeholders toward their goal of closing the Hunters Point Power Plant.

More recently, in an effort to address the CCSF electricity issues, the San Francisco Electricity Resource Plan was adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed by Mayor Willie Brown in December 2002. This Plan provides a long-term vision of the City's possible electricity future. Key elements in the plan are the retirement of the Hunters Point generation and the development of renewable energy resources. Because the Plan extends over a ten-year time horizon, it will need to be adapted and revised to accommodate changing circumstances. The CCSF is also now considering the siting of four gas turbines to generate power within the City (see detail in Appendix 1).

## A.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project

### A.2.1 Statement of Objectives

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6.a) require that to be evaluated in an EIR, alternatives to a proposed project must meet most of the project objectives. PG&E lists the following as its basic objectives for the Jefferson-Martin Project:

- **Meet Electric Demand.** To ensure that the electric system includes adequate capacity to safely and reliably serve the San Francisco and northern San Mateo County area,<sup>1</sup> under normal and reduced generation scenarios.
- **Comply with Planning Criteria.** To ensure that the transmission system serving the northern San Mateo County area will continue to meet planning standards and criteria established by the ISO and the North American Electric Reliability Council (NERC). Compliance with these criteria would also result in continued consistency with the pre-ISO planning guide entitled “Supplementary Guide for Application of the Criteria for San Francisco,” which was considered as part of the October 2000 stakeholder study.
- **Create a More Diverse Transmission System in the Area.** To further increase transmission system reliability in the San Francisco and northern San Mateo County area by providing a second independent major transmission line pathway into the area. By meeting this objective, the project would eliminate the “all eggs in one basket” concern that currently exists in the area.
- **Implement the ISO Board of Governors’ April 2002 Resolution.** To implement the April 2002 ISO Board of Governors’ resolution approving the Jefferson-Martin Project for addition to the ISO-controlled grid, consistent with the ISO Tariff as adopted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission pursuant to the Federal Power Act.

### A.2.2 Electric Supply Issues

This section describes the electricity system (generation and transmission) in the San Francisco peninsula as background for understanding the context of the Proposed Project.

#### A.2.2.1 Existing Power System Facilities and Capabilities

Electric demand in San Francisco and northern San Mateo County is supplied by transmission lines and local power plants. There are two power plants located in San Francisco: PG&E’s Hunters Point and Mirant’s Potrero power plants. Hunters Point has a total active generating capacity of 222 MW from one combustion turbine (52 MW) and one steam unit (Unit 4 at 170 MW). Potrero has a total generating capacity of 363 MW from three combustion turbines (52 MW each) and one steam unit (Unit 3 at 207 MW). Thus, existing in-City generation in San Francisco provides approximately 585 MW of maximum generation capacity. There is also a small 28 MW cogeneration power plant, United Airlines Cogen, near the San Francisco International Airport.

As described above, existing major transmission lines importing power into the area are located in a single corridor along Highway 101 between Martin Substation (just south of the San Francisco boundary) and San Mateo Substation. Taken together, these facilities are capable of importing about 1,230 MW of power into San Francisco and northern San Mateo County.

---

<sup>1</sup> PG&E defines northern San Mateo County as including the areas of Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, Burlingame, Brisbane, Westborough, and Serramonte.

As shown in Figure A-1, transmission to provide energy for the area is currently supplied from San Mateo Substation. Four 230 kV transmission circuits connect to San Mateo Substation from the south and east Bay Areas. The San Mateo Substation receives power from several power plants: Pittsburg Power Plant, Los Medanos Energy Center, and Delta Energy Center. In addition to delivering power from Bay Area power plants, the San Mateo Substation receives power from the 500 kV Western United States power grid received at the Tesla 500/230 kV Substation. The 500 kV system is interconnected with inter- and intrastate power plants.

The combination of the transmission system and generation must be able to supply the area load under a wide variety of conditions and system contingencies in order to meet the applicable NERC, Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC), and ISO planning criteria<sup>2</sup>. As noted above, the total load serving capability (LSC) for the area can vary considerably and is influenced by a number of proposed upgrades to the existing system within and feeding into the area. These upgrades generally involve the rerating of and upgrades to various transmission lines feeding into and within the South Bay and some underground cable enhancements within the City. (These are described in Section C.6, No Project Alternative.) However, even with these other system enhancements, PG&E expects that area load will exceed the available LSC sometime in the 2005/06 timeframe if the Jefferson-Martin line is not constructed. This forecast has not been validated in this EIR, but the information is presented so the reader can understand why the Jefferson-Martin project has been proposed. The CPUC will make a determination regarding project need based on testimony presented in the hearings on the PG&E application.

### **A.2.2.2 Transmission Supply Diversity**

While the existing transmission system is in compliance with all applicable reliability criteria, the ISO and stakeholders have established the need for new transmission projects serving the area to increase the diversity of transmission supply. Currently, San Mateo Substation is the sole 230 kV transmission supply substation for the area of northern San Mateo County and the CCSF. A catastrophic event causing disruption to San Mateo Substation would disrupt transmission supply to the entire area. In addition to originating at a single source, the major transmission lines currently serving the area are concentrated in a single corridor. As part of its long-term planning for the north San Mateo County area, PG&E developed potential projects that would be supplied by a substation other than San Mateo Substation and could be constructed without having to utilize the San Mateo-Martin corridor, in order to diversify the transmission system serving the area. According to PG&E, the Jefferson-Martin Project approved by the ISO meets this objective thereby eliminating the “all-eggs-in-one-basket” reliability drawback. Again, the CPUC has not yet made a determination regarding project need.

### **A.2.2.3 Generation Uncertainty**

As noted above, the continued operation of the existing generation within the San Francisco area is uncertain. There is considerable pressure to retire generation at Hunters Point, in particular Hunters Point Unit 4. This unit is 45 years old and is need of considerable upgrading to meet current air emissions limits. PG&E and the CCSF have agreed that Hunters Point will be closed when the transmission or generation systems provide sufficient replacement capacity.

Mirant Corporation proposes to construct and operate the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project as an expansion to its existing Potrero Power Plant that is located on the eastern shore of the CCSF. Mirant filed an Application for Certification (AFC) on May 31, 2000 for a nominal 540 MW natural gas-fired, combined-

---

<sup>2</sup> Planning criteria define certain levels of system redundancy because electricity must be provided even if some system components (transmission lines or generators) are out of service.

Figure A-1. Existing Transmission System within Vicinity of Project Area

[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

cycle power generating facility. CEC staff filed its Final Staff Assessment (FSA) for the project on February 11, 2002 and recommended that the Energy Commission license the Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project with mitigation, including elimination of the proposed once-through cooling system with an alternative cooling system and mitigation to reduce local diesel emissions from buses and trucks. In May 2003, Mirant filed an amendment to use reclaimed water for cooling. This amendment will be considered by the CEC during the latter half of 2003. There is no guarantee that Unit 7 will be approved, or when it would be operational if approved.

Under an agreement approved by San Francisco Board of Supervisors in late 2002, the city will receive four LM6000 turbines to increase energy reliability and boost the planned phase-out of an antiquated power plant at Hunters Point. The turbines are part of a \$417 million settlement that the Williams Energy Company (Williams) made with the State to reduce prices for electricity in long-term contracts and pay for a variety of local costs. The CCSF will receive \$19 million to assist with siting the turbines. City planners with the Department of the Environment have noted, however, that finding an acceptable location of such cleaner-burning turbines could pose a problem, since such industrial operations are not generally popular with neighbors and there is little industrial land within the CCSF. The current schedule calls for the siting decision to be made by the end of 2003. After that, an AFC is expected to be submitted to the CEC for consideration.

As with the Potrero Unit 7 Project, there is no process to ensure either that the CCSF turbines will, in fact, be constructed, or that they will be operational within a certain timeframe. Even if these facilities were constructed and operational within the timeframe of immediate need, the new generation would merely defer, not eliminate, the need for additional transmission capacity in the project area.

### **A.2.3 Summary of Project Purpose and Need**

In its PEA, PG&E stated that the Jefferson-Martin Project would be needed by September 2005 in order to meet the basic project objectives listed above. The October 2000 Long-Term Study (described above; prepared by the ISO and stakeholders) stated that the project would be needed by the summer of 2006. A determination regarding the need for the Proposed Project and the timing of the need will be made by the CPUC in its decision-making process (described in Section A.3). This EIR does not evaluate project need, but it does summarize available information on need so readers can understand why the project was proposed.

A key issue in determining the ultimate need for a project such as the Jefferson Martin Project is the determination of the ultimate level of load that can be served via the existing transmission system and various expansion and contraction scenarios for local generation. Recently the ISO has undertaken a systematic and comprehensive study of the numerous scenarios that can impact the need and timing for the project as well as the need for future system enhancements after the Jefferson-Martin line is completed. While the study is currently in draft form (the final report is expected in June/July 2003), the majority of the system analysis has been completed. The ISO study tabulates the LSC of the system under a wide variety of conditions, while remaining within applicable reliability criteria. In the study, the LSC is determined for both the City of San Francisco as well for the Peninsula south of the City and north of the Ravenswood Substation.

Table A-1 presents the LSC for a variety of conditions with and without the Jefferson-Martin project. The LSC information only provides an upper bound, above which load is no longer served in accordance with the accepted reliability criteria. Load above the LSC can be subject to interruption. Thus the LSC by itself only determines how much load can be served from the system. In order to determine when the system is no longer reliable to serve all of the load and is in need of upgrades, one must examine the LSC combined with a load forecast.

**Table A-1. Load Serving Capability Scenarios (MW)**

Transmission System	Bay Area Generation	CCSF LSC	Peninsula LSC	Total LSC
Current system -- without Jefferson-Martin	All current generation (incl HP4)	899	876	1,775
	HP 4 retired	779	781	1,560
	HP 4 retired, Potrero 7 constructed	893	872	1,765
	HP 4 retired, 4 CCSF peakers installed	882	863	1,745
Current system -- without Jefferson-Martin -- with planned PG&E system upgrades	All current generation (incl HP4)	991	949	1,940
	HP 4 retired	779	781	1,560
	HP 4 retired, Potrero 7 constructed	977	938	1,915
	HP 4 retired, 4 CCSF peakers installed	966	929	1,895
Jefferson Martin -- with planned PG&E system upgrades	All current generation (incl HP4)	1,091	1,029	2,120
	HP 4 retired	1,060	1,005	2,065
	HP 4 retired, Potrero 7 constructed	1,094	1,031	2,125
	HP 4 retired, 4 CCSF peakers installed	1,099	1,036	2,135

Source: CAISO San Francisco Peninsula Load Serving Capability Report (4/30/03)

Peak demand forecasts have inherent uncertainties, and the sudden, large drop in peak demand observed in 2001 further increases those uncertainties. PG&E has recently revised its load forecast for the City and Peninsula areas; the revised forecast is presented in Table A-2. This new forecast, developed in March 2003, was derived by PG&E utilizing a “top down” approach, whereby the company’s peak demand forecast is allocated to various sections of the system. This methodology begins with a forecast of the overall system peak that is based on various economic factors such as growth in households, industrial activity, and assumptions regarding future conservation. Once the system peak is forecasted, it is then disaggregated down to various geographic sectors of the PG&E system. This new forecast is lower than the lowest of the previous three forecasts that PG&E presented in the PEA for the City of San Francisco and Peninsula, reflecting the recent slowing of the local economy.

**Table A-2. Load Forecast (MW)**

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
San Francisco	900	915	927	942	955	968	978	989	998	1,008	1,018
Peninsula	957	967	988	1,007	1,023	1,037	1,049	1,061	1,072	1,084	1,095
Total	1,857	1,882	1,915	1,949	1,978	2,005	2,028	2,050	2,070	2,092	2,114

Source: PG&E March 2003 1-in-10 summer area base case loads for Greater Bay Area

As noted in Tables A-1 and A-2, the timing of the need for the Jefferson-Martin Project is dependent upon generation construction (Potrero Unit 7 and the four CCSF turbines) and potential generation retirement (Hunters Point Unit 4) considered. Under most scenarios presented by PG&E and the ISO to date, the proposed transmission line is shown to be needed to support the Peninsula load by the 2005/06 timeframe.

## A.2.4 Area Load Growth

The load growth data reflected in Table A-2 above was provided by PG&E in March 2003 and represents the 1:10 forecast<sup>3</sup> for the Bay Area. This level of forecast is consistent with that called for under the various planning criteria.

<sup>3</sup> This 1:10 forecast represents the load that may be expected to occur based on weather conditions that reflect a one in ten chance of occurring.

While based on methodology utilized in some of the previous forecasts for the area, this new forecast represents a substantial downward adjustment relative to previous forecasts, reflecting the decrease in local economic activity. The most recent forecasted growth in area peak demand over the next 10 years averages slightly above 1% per year.

## **A.3 Agency Use of This Document**

### **A.3.1 CPUC Process**

Pursuant to Article XII of the Constitution of the State of California, the CPUC is charged with the regulation of investor-owned public utilities, including PG&E. The CPUC is the lead State agency for CEQA compliance in evaluation of the PG&E's proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project, and has directed the preparation of this EIR. This EIR will be used by the Commission, in conjunction with other information developed in the Commission's formal record, to act on PG&E's application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) for construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Under CEQA requirements, the CPUC will determine the adequacy of the Final EIR and, if adequate, will certify the document as complying with CEQA. The Commission will also act on PG&E's application for a CPCN. If it approves a project with significant and unmitigable impacts, it must state why in a "Statement of Overriding Considerations," which would be included in the Commission's decision on the application.

The CPUC has assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Charlotte Terkeurst to oversee the hearings on the Proposed Project, and Commissioner Loretta Lynch is the Assigned Commissioner for the CPCN application. The ALJ, in accordance with her Scoping Memo, will hold Evidentiary Hearings on the CPCN application in December 2003 and will issue a Proposed Decision on the project in April 2004. The ALJ's Decision, and the Evidentiary Hearings, will cover issues of project need, project cost, and other considerations.

### **A.3.2 Other Agencies**

Several other State agencies will rely on information in this EIR to inform them in their decision over issuance of specific permits related to project construction or operation. In addition to the CPUC, State agencies such as the Department of Transportation, Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Office of Historic Preservation would be involved in reviewing and/or approving the project. On the federal level, agencies with potential reviewing and/or permitting authority include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

The National Park Service (NPS; Golden Gate National Recreation Area) has also stated that it has permitting authority over the Proposed Project. NPS has not identified the permit that would apply. CCSF has disagreed that NPS has permitting authority for the Proposed Project.

No local discretionary (e.g., use) permits are required, since the CPUC has preemptive jurisdiction over the construction, maintenance, and operation of PG&E facilities in California. PG&E would still have to obtain all ministerial building and encroachment permits from local jurisdictions, and the CPUC's General Order 131-D requires PG&E to comply with local building, design, and safety standards to the greatest degree feasible to minimize project conflicts with local conditions. The CPUC's authority does not preempt special districts, such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, or other State agencies or the federal government.

Table A-3 lists the federal, State, and local permits and authorization required for the Proposed Project.

**Table A-3. Permits Required for the Jefferson-Martin Project**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Jurisdiction/Purpose</b>
<b>Federal Agencies</b>		
Nationwide or Individual Permit (Section 404 of the Clean Water Act)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Waters of the United States, including wetlands
Section 7 consultation (through U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's review process)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Consultation on federally listed species; incidental take authorization (if required)
Lift Plan Permit	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	Helicopter Construction Plans
Section 106 of the NHPA Review (through U.S. Army Corp of Engineer's review process)	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Cultural Resource Management Plan (if appropriate)
<b>State Agencies</b>		
Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity	CPUC	Overall Project approval and CEQA review
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System – General Construction Stormwater Permit	California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Francisco Bay Region	This permit applies to all construction Projects that disturb more than 5 acres
Section 401 Water Quality Certification (or waiver thereof)	RWQCB	Requests RWQCB's certification that the Project is consistent with State water quality standards
Road Closures	Caltrans	I-280, SR92, and SR35 closures during sky-crane material overflights
Endangered Species consultation	California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Consultation on State-listed species; incidental take authorization (if required)
Section 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement	CDFG	Modifications to shoreline protection at San Andreas Lake
Consultation (through CEQA review process)	State Historic Preservation Officer	Cultural resources management (if appropriate)
Authority to Construct/Permit to Operate	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	Demolition of existing towers
<b>Local Agencies</b>		
Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Site Activity Permit	San Mateo County	Work in Guadalupe Canyon Parkway
Roadway Encroachment and Closure Permit	San Mateo County	Permit to install guard poles in roadway ROW, temporary road closures
Roadway Encroachment and Closure Permit	City of Brisbane, Daly City, Town of Coma, Town of Hillsborough, City of South San Francisco, City of San Bruno	Permit to install guard poles in roadway ROW, temporary road closures
Grading and Building Permits	City of Brisbane, Daly City, Town of Coma, Town of Hillsborough, City of South San Francisco, City of San Bruno	Permission to conduct grading and building activities
Trail Closures	San Mateo County Parks and Recreation/SFPUC	Permission to close trail during construction

The CCSF, through its Public Utilities Commission (“SFPUC”), owns fee title to the Peninsula Watershed lands. As the fee owner, the CCSF has the legal authority to transfer ownership of the watershed lands or to authorize uses of the watershed lands. PG&E currently operates electric transmission facilities on the watershed lands, including an existing 60 kV double-circuit transmission line that PG&E has proposed to rebuild in connection with the Proposed Project. The existing 60 kV transmission lines are located within the easement area that PG&E obtained from the CCSF. These easements authorize PG&E, among other things, to construct, reconstruct, maintain and operate electric transmission lines within these areas.

As explained in Section B (Project Description), the current easement for the existing 60 kV transmission lines is typically 50 feet wide and would need to be expanded to 100 feet, although some specific locations may vary depending upon final engineering. PG&E currently anticipates that it would obtain these property rights from the CCSF either by voluntary agreement or pursuant to a condemnation proceeding. PG&E would not need to secure a use permit or other permit from CCSF in order to construct or operate the Proposed Project.

## **A.4 Reader's Guide to This EIR**

### **A.4.1 Incorporation by Reference**

PG&E's Proponent's Environmental Assessment (submitted as part of its Application No. A.02-09-043 for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project) contains certain information that is incorporated by reference in some sections of this EIR. This document is available for public review during normal business hours at the CPUC's Central Files (505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco), in local libraries (see Section H), and also via the Internet at [http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/asp/jefferson\\_martin/jeffmartin.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/asp/jefferson_martin/jeffmartin.htm)

### **A.4.2 EIR Organization**

This EIR is organized as follows:

**Executive Summary.** A summary description of the Proposed Project, the alternatives, their respective environmental impacts and the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

**Impact Summary Tables.** A tabulation of the impacts and mitigation measures for the Proposed Project and alternatives.

**Section A (Introduction/Overview).** A discussion of the background, purpose and need for the project, briefly describing the proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project, and outlining the public agency use of the EIR and identifying the changes incorporated in the document.

**Section B (Project Description).** Detailed descriptions of the proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project.

**Section C (Alternatives Process and Description).** Description of the alternatives evaluation process, description of alternatives considered but eliminated from further analysis and the rationale therefor, and description of the alternatives analyzed in Section D.

**Section D (Environmental Analysis).** A comprehensive analysis and assessment of impacts (including cumulative impacts) and mitigation measures for the Proposed Project and several alternatives, including the No Project Alternative. This section is divided into main sections for each environmental issue area (e.g., Air Quality, Biological Resources) that contain the environmental settings, impacts, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Project and each alternative. At the end of each issue area analysis, a Mitigation Monitoring table is provided.

**Section E (Comparison of Alternatives).** Identification of the CEQA Environmentally Superior Alternative and a discussion of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the Proposed Project and alternatives that were evaluated.

**Section F (Additional CEQA Considerations).** A discussion of growth-inducing impacts, irreversible environmental changes, and cumulative impacts.

**Section G (Proposed Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan).** A discussion of the CPUC's mitigation monitoring program requirements for the project as approved by the CPUC.

**Section H (Public Participation).** A brief description of the public participation program for this EIR.

**Appendices:**

1. Alternatives Screening Report
2. Report Preparation
3. EMF Data
4. Land Use Policies
5. Biological Resources
6. Cultural Resources